

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 have been amended and claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice.. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In accordance with the Examiner's remarks, to more clearly define the invention, Applicant has amended claim 1. As a result, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action reject claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,725 ("Nakanishi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 not present in the prior art is a controller further adapted to retrieve a plurality of redial phone numbers from said first and second memories, said phone numbers being related to said registered

phone numbers for sequential dialing, the numbers being sequentially dialed until a connection is made.

In the present invention, a mobile telephone with a redial function is claimed such that a plurality of registered phone numbers related to a plurality of registered names are retrievably stored in a first memory. A second memory then stores a plurality of redial phone numbers which have been dialed. A controller relates the registered phone numbers with the redial phone number such that the mobile telephone will redial a registered phone number related to a registered name as well as redial numbers which have been related to the registered name or registered phone number. When multiple telephone numbers can be associated with a redial number such that if a party does not answer a first dialed number, other related numbers will be sequentially dialed until the party is reached.

In contrast, Nakanishi discloses a telephone having a call history log as well as a stored directory. In Nakanishi, the call history is collated with the stored directory so that calls (numbers) in the call history, not stored in the telephone directory, can be displayed. See, column 7, lines 17-25. Further, the display of Nakanishi merely displays the call history by using the redial key. Nakanishi does not disclose a controller which is adapted to retrieve a plurality of redial numbers and sequentially dial the redial phone numbers until a connection is made.

Claims 2-5 and 9-11 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 1. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Nakanishi and

are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2-5 and 9-11 should also be allowed.

Among the limitations of independent claim 7 not taught or recited in the Nakanishi reference is repeating the redialing step “while sequentially selecting the retrieved registered phone numbers until a connection is made”.

The Office Action asserts that this limitation is disclosed in the Nakanishi reference in that the call history data stores a call history storing portion and a telephone directory storing portion. The stored history is maintained as the call history storing portion and a memory capacity for numerous files is maintained as the telephone directory storing portion. However, while this discloses that there is a call history list stored, it does not disclose repeating the retrieval and dialing of the stored numbers until a connection is made. As such, claim 7 is allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 8 depends from, and contains all the limitations of claim 7. This dependent claim also recites additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 7, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Nakanishi and is also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claim 8 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: April 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorneys for Applicant

IRB/mgs